

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-35 are presently active in this case, Claims 12 and 23 having been amended and Claims 34 and 35 having been added by way of the present Amendment. Care has been taken such that no new matter has been entered by the amendments set forth herein. The claims are fully supported by the written description and drawings of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 12, 13, 18-21, 23, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,414,450) in view of Sakurai (U.S. Patent No. 4,715,597). Claims 14-16, 22, 25-27, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshino et al. in view of Sakurai and further in view of Fujitsu (EP 0 556 071). Claims 17 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshino et al. in view of Sakurai and further in view of Brooks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,595,935). For the reasons discussed below, the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

The basic requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness as set forth in MPEP 2143 include (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of

obviousness cannot be established in the present case because the cited references, either taken singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Claim 12 of the present application recites a ticket printing device comprising, among other features, at least one print head and means for driving a ticket across the at least one print head. The means for driving includes a block including a first roller configured to cause the ticket to move and a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket, where the block includes only one second roller. Claim 23 recites a ticket printing device comprising, among other features, at least one print head and a driving mechanism configured to move a ticket across the at least one print head. The driving mechanism includes a block including a first roller configured to move the ticket and a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket, where the block includes only one second roller. The Applicant submits that the cited reference, either taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the above features.

The Official Action notes that the Oshino et al. reference does not teach a first roller configured to cause the ticket to move and a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket. The Official Action cites the Sakurai reference for the teaching of such features. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Oshino et al. reference, nor the Sakurai reference teach a block including a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket, where the block includes only one second roller, as expressly recited in Claims 12 and 23 of the present application.

As noted above and in the Official Action, the Oshino et al. reference does not teach a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket. Thus, the Oshino et al. reference

clearly does not disclose a block including a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket, where the block includes only one second roller.

The Sakurai reference is cited for the teaching of an idler (23), which is cited for the teaching of the second roller of the claims of the present application. The Sakurai et al. reference describes an automatic document feeder shown in Figure 3 that includes a pair of sub-rollers (9a and 9b), a pair of idler rollers (23 and 23), and a pair of feed rollers (10 and 10) that are all provided on a common shaft. The sub-rollers (9a and 9b) are provided at the center, the feed rollers (10 and 10) are provided on the outside of the sub-rollers (9a and 9b), and the idler rollers (23 and 23) are provided on the outside of the feed rollers (10 and 10). The idler rollers (23 and 23) are mounted to be freely rotatable of the shaft (column 4, lines 9-11), and the Sakurai reference teaches that the idlers (23 and 23) do not positively participate in the function of the transportation of the sheet of document (4) (column 4, lines 40-43).

The Sakurai reference does not disclose or suggest a device having only one idler roller (23 and 23). Thus, the Sakurai reference does not disclose a block including a second roller configured to be rotated only by the ticket, where the block includes only one second roller.

Because the cited references, either taken singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established in the present case. Thus, the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.


Application Serial No.: 10/009,774  
Reply to Office Action dated February 22, 2005

The dependent claims are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for the independent claims from which they depend.

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf

I:\atty\cdw\21xxxx\216735US2PCT\am1.doc